

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 USC §112.

The Examiner states that Claim 1 is directed to a system and recites the following structural elements: "an industry related portal", and "a second portal of a different industry", which the Examiner states is confusing.

The Examiner states that a portal is a collection of links, content and services designed to guide users to information. The Examiner states it is not clear that the term "portal" represents a structural element.

Applicant believes that the term "portal" is a structural element and is supported by the United States Patent and Trademark Office database. If one includes the term "portal" in search of the United States Patent and Trademark Office database in issued claims, 2,943 patents have been issued with claims having the structural element "portal". Although a small number of these patents relates to a medical portal, over 2,000 of these patents relate to "portal" as defined by applicant. Applicant gives the following examples to show that the term "portal" is a structural element as used by applicant: 7,756,744, 7,756,731, 7,752,603, 7,752,328, 7,752,308, 7,752,127, 7,752,095, 7,747,746.

If the Examiner were correct that the term "portal" defined by applicant does not support a structural element, then there would be grounds to invalidate over 2,000 issued U.S. patents.


Therefore, applicant believes that the above claims are not indefinite.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 7 and 9 as being obvious over Chipman in view of Krishan. The Examiner stated that the prior language "consisting essentially of" is construed as comprising. Applicant has amended the claims to use the terminology "consisting of". Because the prior art alone or in combination teaches elements beyond the scope of the invention, Applicants amendment to the use of "consisting of" language avoids the rejection of the prior art. Therefore, the above prior art is not obvious over the claims in its current form.


For the same reasons, Claims 3 and 6 are also not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 477782137 US
Date of Deposit: July 13, 2010
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
July 13, 2010

Signature: 
Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,


Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
(516) 739-1500